•	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

25

26

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC DISCLOSURE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN RE THE MATTER OF ENFORCEMENT ACTION AGAINST

PDC CASE NO. 01-134

Protect Our Pets and Wildlife,

ORDER OF REFERRAL TO THE WASHINGTON STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE

Respondent.

## **INTRODUCTION**

On October 20, 2000, the Public Disclosure Commission staff received a complaint concerning, in part, expenditures made by the Respondent, specifically related to purchases of time for running television ads. The allegations and the resulting Report of Investigation involved the Respondent's failure to properly or timely report expenditures to a media consultant and for television ads placed by the Respondent in support of Initiative 713. Following the initial investigation, a brief enforcement hearing was held on October 18, 2001. The Presiding Officer continued the hearing for two weeks and instructed staff to further investigate the placement of ads and cancellation policies. Staff did further inquiries into the allegations.

A subsequent brief enforcement hearing was convened on November 1, 2001, but no testimony or evidence was taken. The matter was referred to the full Commission for a full enforcement hearing. That hearing was held on January 22, 2002. The staff presented evidence and testimony as to the sequence of actions taken by the Respondent and its agent, Fenn & King,

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
1	6
,	7
	8
	9
1	
1	1
12	
13	
14	
1:	5
10	5
1′	
18	3
19	•
20	
21	
22	
23	3

regarding its agreement with Fenn & King and the television spots run in support of their position on Initiative 713. The Respondent presented no evidence in addition to what had been provided during the investigation at the hearing other than the cross-examination of the Investigator. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Commission requested briefing concerning the question of whether certain actions by the Respondent were reportable expenditures.

PDC staff submitted to the Commission the Report of Investigation dated July 1, 2001, the Brief Enforcement Hearing Memo dated October 8, 2001, the Addendum to the Report of Investigation dated October 30, 2001, the second Addendum to the Report of Investigation dated December 13, 2001, and a Staff Memo to the Commission dated January 15, 2002. In addition, the Commission was given a written briefing by the Staff's attorney and a written briefing by the Respondent's attorney.

At its regular meeting in the PDC Offices in Olympia, Washington on February 26, 2002, the Commission reviewed the Report of Investigation, the Brief Enforcement Hearing Memo, the Addendum to the Report of Investigation, the second Addendum to the Report of Investigation, the Staff Memo to the Commission, the written briefing by the Staff's attorney and the written briefing by the Respondent's attorney. In addition, the Commission considered oral arguments of the parties concerning whether the Respondent violated RCW 42.17.080 and 42.17.090.

Present were Commission members Christine Yorozu (Chair), Gerry Marsh, Susan Brady, and Lois Clement. The Respondent appeared at the hearing, both personally and through its attorney of record, Shawn Newman. The Staff appeared both personally and through their attorney of record, Linda A. Dalton, Senior Assistant Attorney General. The hearing was tape-recorded.

Following oral argument by the attorneys for the Commission staff and the Respondent, and consideration of the material submitted by the Commission Staff and the Respondent, and after deliberation, the Commission directed the following:

24

25

## ORDER OF REFERRAL

By a vote of 4-0, the Commission found that there are apparent multiple violations of RCW 42.17.080 and 42.17.090 by the Respondent, Protect Our Pets and Wildlife. The Commission found that the maximum penalty that can be assessed by the Commission is inadequate in light of the apparent multiple violations. Therefore, in lieu of entering Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and an Order, the Commission hereby refers this case to the Washington State Attorney General's Office pursuant to RCW 42.17.360 and .395, and WAC 390-37-100.

The Commission further ordered that if the Attorney General's Office declines to file a complaint in Superior Court based upon the apparent violations referenced in this order of referral or does not enter into a settlement for the apparent violations referenced in this order of referral, this case is to be referred back to the Public Disclosure Commission for further consideration.

Vicki Rippie, Executive Director

Date Signed

MARCH 7, ZOOZ

Copies to be provided to:

Linda A. Dalton, Senior Assistant Attorney General

Counsel for Commission Staff

Shawn Newman, Counsel for Respondent

Nancy Krier, Assistant Attorney General

20 Counsel for Commission